ATHENA SWAN BRONZE DEPARTMENT AWARDS
Recognise that in addition to institution-wide policies, the department is working to promote gender equality and to identify and address challenges particular to the department and discipline.

ATHENA SWAN SILVER DEPARTMENT AWARDS
In addition to the future planning required for Bronze department recognition, Silver department awards recognise that the department has taken action in response to previously identified challenges and can demonstrate the impact of the actions implemented.

Note: Not all institutions use the term ‘department’. There are many equivalent academic groupings with different names, sizes and compositions. The definition of a ‘department’ can be found in the Athena SWAN awards handbook.

COMPLETING THE FORM
DO NOT ATTEMPT TO COMPLETE THIS APPLICATION FORM WITHOUT READING THE ATHENA SWAN AWARDS HANDBOOK.

This form should be used for applications for Bronze and Silver department awards. You should complete each section of the application applicable to the award level you are applying for.

Additional areas for Silver applications are highlighted throughout the form: 5.2, 5.4, 5.5(iv)

If you need to insert a landscape page in your application, please copy and paste the template page at the end of the document, as per the instructions on that page. Please do not insert any section breaks as to do so will disrupt the page numbers.

WORD COUNT
The overall word limit for applications are shown in the following table.

There are no specific word limits for the individual sections and you may distribute words over each of the sections as appropriate. At the end of every section, please state how many words you have used in that section.

We have provided the following recommendations as a guide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department application</th>
<th>Silver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word limit</strong></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recommended word count</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Letter of endorsement</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of the department</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-assessment process</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Picture of the department</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supporting and advancing women’s careers</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Case studies</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Further information</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abbreviations

- Academic Staff – All Staff on Pathway 1, 2 or 3, includes fixed term PDRAs
- AP – Action Point (for future Action)
- APM – Annual Progress Monitoring
- APR – Annual Progress Review
- AUA - Association of University Administrators
- BA – Bronze Action (enacted since 2015 arising from Bronze Award)
- BAME – Black and Minority Ethnic
- BBSRC – Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council
- CREATE – Cultivating Research and Teaching Excellence (professional development scheme for academics)
- DC – Deputy Chair
- ECR – Early Career Researcher (fixed-term PDRAs, Fellows, PIs <3 years in position
- EDI(C) – Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (Committee)
- GW4 – Great Western Four Doctoral Training Partnership
- HESA – Higher Education Statistics Agency
- HoS – Head of School
- HoT – Head of Teaching
- HR – Human Resources
- L1 – First year of Undergraduate Study
- L2 – Second year of Undergraduate Study
- L3 – Third year of Undergraduate Study
- L4 – Fourth year of Undergraduate study (MSci)
- LSB – Life Sciences Building
- LSF – Life Sciences Faculty (being created in August 2018)
- NERC – Natural Environment Research Council
- NSS – National Student Survey
- PDRA – Postdoctoral Research Assistant/Associate
- PG – Postgraduate student (includes PhD and MRes students)
- PI – Principal Investigator
• PS(S) – Professional Services (Staff)
• RCUK – Research Councils UK
• REF – Research Excellence Framework
• SAT – Self-Assessment Team
• SBS – School of Biological Sciences
• SEA – Senior Executive Assistant
• SMP – Statutory Maternity Pay
• SMT – Senior Management Team
• SPARC – School Planning and Resource Committee
• SSS – Staff and Postgraduate Student Survey
• STA – Senior Teaching Associate
• STEMM – Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics and Medicine
• UG – Undergraduate student
• UoB – University of Bristol

Unless explained otherwise, all figures are based on headcounts rather than FTE. Benchmarking comes from the Higher Education Statistics Agency. Please note that benchmarking data are not available for MRes and PhD levels separately.
1. LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT FROM THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT
Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

An accompanying letter of endorsement from the head of department should be included. If the head of department is soon to be succeeded, or has recently taken up the post, applicants should include an additional short statement from the incoming head.

Note: Please insert the endorsement letter immediately after this cover page.
Dear Ms Sarah Dickinson-Hyams

Since our Bronze Award in 2015, the School leadership and the EDIC have used the Athena SWAN process to transform the School’s awareness of, and commitment to, equality and diversity. Our Bronze Actions, capitalising on our move to a purpose-built LSB have achieved a fundamental change in the culture, management, and composition of the School.

Equality and inclusivity are now central to how the School works. Students and staff openly challenge behaviours and ask for long-standing practices to be re-examined, and plan and participate events to address the issues they raise.

I gave my full commitment as HoS, and as a crucial part of the SAT, to ensure the EDIC’s aspirations were quickly translated into action, and that issues such as financial support for returning carers received the Faculty resources they needed.

The almost doubled response rates (>85%) to our recent Staff and Student Surveys reflect how engaged we have become as we work to improve our working environment. The data presented here demonstrate dramatic improvement in key areas, including perceptions of School culture, training and career support, where the striking gender gaps observed in 2014 are almost all hugely reduced. For example, the percentage of women who feel they receive effective career support has increased from 38-63% since 2014, now only 7% lower than men (previously 22% lower). Such dramatic evidence for improvement is great motivation as we introduce further actions to transform the School.

Key changes since 2015 have included improved mentoring of Early-Career Researchers and PhD students, through more formalised annual reviews (98% of PhD students received reviews in 2017, compared to 16% in 2014, with an increase of 22% in those finding them helpful), and developing a workload model that evaluates work quality as
well as quantity to promote career progression. We have introduced Acceptable Workplace behaviour Advisors and External Mentors to address concerns about inappropriate behaviour, coupled with mandatory unconscious bias and appropriate behaviour training for all staff. As a result, over 80% of staff and students now feel there is a strong culture of respect and support in the School.

Our 2016 survey highlighted concerns among Professional Services Staff about promotion opportunities. We pushed for a Faculty-wide redesign of management to improve training, pro-active promotion of staff between Faculties, and a clearer career pathway. This has allowed agile working to become possible for many more staff and has led directly to rapid promotion of women in these roles (Case Study 1).

We have also hugely improved our support for carers, not only on return to work, but protecting their right to focus on family during leave, for example by providing a ‘leave buddy’ to take on crucial responsibilities.

Finally, we have introduced Deputies for all senior roles to give carers the freedom to take on senior responsibilities, allowing their insight to better permeate into management. This has been especially significant because it allowed the appointment of an incoming HoS who would not otherwise have applied (Case Study 2). The personal experience and leverage she will bring to EDI issues in the School will be enormous.

There remains much to do, which is skilfully captured in our ongoing Action Plan. However, I am deeply proud of the huge changes we’ve made since 2014.

I am happy to confirm that what is contained in this report is an honest and accurate account of the School.

Yours sincerely

Michael Benton
(Head of School)
Short statement from the incoming Head of School:

Dear Members of the Committee,

I am delighted to be taking leadership of this School, which, as a result of enthusiastic engagement with the Athena SWAN Charter, has a highly inclusive culture and enormous drive to find everything that could be better and put it right.

As a member of the EDIC since 2013, and a champion of women in science for much longer, I have helped shape and implement its actions, including the ongoing Action Plan, of which I am very proud. This builds on the huge achievements of our Bronze Actions, extending the reach of our activities beyond gender in academia into professional services, and embracing a wider diversity of issues including widening participation.

Key actions I would like to highlight include:

- Capitalizing on the opportunity for structural change that shaping a new Faculty provides;
- Catalysing and shaping a new, unified workload model for the new Faculty (AP8.4);
- Working with HR and the Unions to improve mechanisms for dealing with and reporting outcomes of complaints about inappropriate behaviour (AP8.2);
- Widening participation in STEMM subjects by leading an analysis of BAME experiences and achievements across the new Faculty (AP1.1).

I hope you enjoy our application.

Yours sincerely

Prof. Claire Grierson

(Incoming Head of School)

(196 words)
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT

Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

Please provide a brief description of the department including any relevant contextual information. Present data on the total number of academic staff, professional and support staff and students by gender.

The School of Biological Sciences (SBS) is one of the largest departments at the UoB and hosts internationally outstanding research, ranking 18th in UK Biological Sciences in the 2014 REF. The SBS employs 35 tenured Academic Staff (29% female, compared to 18% in 2013), 50 PDRAs, fellows and teaching associates (60% female). The postgraduate student body contains 92 PhD and 39 MRes students, born in 21 non-UK countries (6 EU, 15 non-EU). The Professional Services Staff, who provide support for teaching and research, comprise 36 individuals (72% female). There are currently 667 undergraduates (65% female).

Figure 1: School of Biological Sciences staff and student profile by gender (2017/18).

In July 2014, the SBS moved to the purpose-built Life Sciences Building (LSB). The building was designed to facilitate collaborative working and informal interactions, with multiple breakout rooms and a large social space and open-air terrace on the top floor. The co-location in LSB of researchers from other Schools (Earth Sciences, Social Medicine, and Geography) allows sharing of good practice and research activity with other Faculties.

The move to the LSB represented an exceptional opportunity to transform social, cultural and working interactions within SBS. The LSB also provided a new environment to enact our Bronze Actions to increase inclusivity, which were shaped by our 2014 SSS, and the data presented in our 2014 Bronze Application.

“[Since 2014, there is] far more communication between staff and students and many more opportunities for collaboration. Also, a far more open and relaxed working environment. These changes are largely a result of the new LSB” (PG, SSS, 2017).
In August 2018, the School becomes part of a new Life Sciences Faculty, with Biochemistry; Cellular and Molecular Medicine; Experimental Psychology; and Physiology, Pharmacology and Neuroscience. **This new Faculty will provide an exceptional opportunity to make structural changes to standardise and improve EDI provision**, in particular support for carers, PS staff promotion, Acceptable Workplace Behaviour policy, and workload distribution.

**The SBS has been an innovator in Athena SWAN actions.** For example, the Schools of Economics, Finance and Management and Experimental Psychology have adopted our Workload Allocation Model and our use of External Mentors (both introduced in 2015). We are one of the only UoB Schools with a dedicated family and baby change room, and an Athena SWAN Twitter feed.

“The culture of the School has changed hugely in the past few years. It feels like a variety of views and ways of thinking are being included now in how the School is being run” (SSS, 2017).
3. THE SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Recommended word count: Bronze: 1000 words | Silver: 1000 words

Describe the self-assessment process. This should include:

(i) a description of the self-assessment team
(ii) an account of the self-assessment process
(iii) plans for the future of the self-assessment team

(i) The Self-Assessment Team

The SBS Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) was formed in 2013, and has 16 members representing academics, PS staff, UGs and PGs (Table 1). All EDIC members, as well as the current HoS, were involved in the self-assessment process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Group</th>
<th>Committee representation &amp; responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jon Bridle (M)</strong>* Academic</td>
<td>Reader. <strong>EDIC Chair.</strong> Interested in how gender inequality connects with economic and cultural marginalisation and social justice (<em>FG1,2a</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Chen (M)</strong> Professional Services</td>
<td>Stores assistant. Represents technicians and post-graduate students, particularly with increasing workloads and responsibilities, and concerns of unfair treatment (<em>FG4</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anthony Crawford (M)</strong> Professional Services</td>
<td>Technical manager. Represents and supports core technicians and research-grant funded staff. Liaises with Faculty technical manager (<em>FG2b</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bethany Eldridge (F)</strong> Postgraduate</td>
<td>Post-graduate researcher. Represents postgraduate committee, keen to encourage more communication between UGs and PGs (<em>FG3</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sinead English (F)† Academic</strong></td>
<td>Research fellow/Senior lecturer. <strong>EDIC Deputy Chair.</strong> Concerned about caring responsibilities, flexible working, leave returners. Newly-appointed staff member (<em>FG1, FG2a</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claire Grierson (F)</strong> Academic</td>
<td>Professor (HoS from August 2018). Trained Acceptable Workplace Behaviour Advisor, represents those with caring needs (<em>FG4</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Talya Hackett (F)</em> Teaching Staff</em>*</td>
<td>Senior teaching associate. Represents issues faced by teaching-only staff and PDRAs (<em>FG2a</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jill Harrison (F)</strong> Academic</td>
<td>Research Fellow/Senior lecturer. Particularly interested in graduate student support as Deputy Director of Graduate Studies (<em>FG3</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will Hurley (M)</strong> Professional Services</td>
<td>Teaching laboratory technician. Represents concerns of laboratory technicians and keen to promote inclusivity in workplace (<em>FG2b</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Pereira Maia</td>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Memmott</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Morley</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Pitman</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrie Sadler</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Whitney</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*also worked on the Bronze Application; †has caring responsibilities. FG (focus groups) – FG1: Self-assessment process; FG2: Key career transitions: (a) ECRs; (b) PSS; FG3: Flexible working and care leave; FG4: Organisation and culture, student mentoring.

All EDIC members assisted in the completion and monitoring of Bronze Actions, contributed evidence for the application text, developed and shaped the current Action Plan (especially within their Focus Group), and are responsible for its implementation.

EDIC composition is monitored by the Chair and DCs to ensure that: (a) all sections and roles with SBS are represented and with appropriate gender balance; (b) the committee reflects on a breadth of caring responsibilities and career stages.

Each EDIC member normally serves for a maximum of two years (Chairs for a maximum of three). New EDIC members are solicited by an email each year from the Chair to all SBS members. The EDIC also approaches potential new members in consideration of (a) and (b) above.
Due to recent turnover in EDIC membership, there is currently an over-representation of female academic staff (5/6 female) and under-representation of female PS staff (1/5), relative to previous years (2015-7: 55% female academic staff; 22% female PSS).

- **APB.3: Balance the gender and variety of roles and career stages on all SBS committees:** By July 2018, new recruits to the EDIC will correct the temporary change in the committee’s gender ratios in these sectors.

(ii) An account of the self-assessment process

The self-assessment process has involved **continuous implementation and monitoring of Bronze actions** since 2015, and **diverse means of consultation with SBS members** both directly and through formal reporting structures to other School and Faculty committees (Figure 3).

**Figure 4.** Connections between the EDIC and other School and Faculty committees, and consultation with staff and students*:

*Solid lines indicate direct communication (where the same member sits on both EDIC and the relevant committee); dashed lines consultation as described in the text.

**Frequency and structure of EDIC meetings**

**The EDIC meets at least every 2 months during term-time.** Additional Focus Group meetings, consisting of subsets of the EDIC (FGs in Table 1) have met more frequently (every 2–4 weeks) in preparing this application.

**At each meeting,** each committee member reports on EDIC actions being enacted by the SBS committees they sit on or provides feedback from discussion events (BA1.5). EDIC members of Faculty committees also report on Faculty-level initiatives and
progress. The EDIC refines existing actions, and develops new actions suggested by feedback, and annual analysis of data.

**Following meetings**, members report back to other SBS committees recommended revised actions. The EDI Chair or DC reports to SPARC, which meets monthly to decide SBS policy and commit resources. Feasible timescales and financing for revised actions are decided with the School Manager. The EDIC chair reports changes in policy or action at the next Staff Assembly (where EDI is a standing issue) and the action plan is revised on the EDI website.

**The former and incoming HoS have been on the EDIC since 2013**. The incoming HoS will remain a committee member until 2022 to ensure SBS EDI issues have appropriate leverage in the new Faculty. Since 2016, the HoS has not been an official member of the EDIC. Given his tenure as HoS was an interim arrangement, it was decided that the EDIC Chair and SEA (EDI Deputy Chair and PA to HoS) would present monthly summaries to the HoS and ensure EDI issues are a standing item during senior management meetings. The HoS has prioritised EDI activities at SPARC, obtained financial support for additional SBS parental leave at Faculty Level, and has engaged with the self-assessment process as much as an active EDIC member.

*Consultation between EDIC and the rest of the School*

**All members of SBS have diverse ways to find out about SBS EDI actions**, to respond to these actions, and inform new ones.

**Communication from the EDIC to the School** is via the website, which includes all EDIC agendas and minutes, and a Twitter feed *(BA2.2)*. A monthly *EDI Bulletin* is emailed to all SBS members, detailing training opportunities, EDI-themed lectures, and discussion groups.

**Staff consultation and feedback** is achieved through a combination of open discussion sessions and individual, anonymous surveys:

**EDI issues are a standing item on all School committees** *(BA1.6)*, as well as termly Staff Assemblies and annual Away Days.

**The EDIC organises termly discussion lunches open to all staff**, and focused discussions for PDRAs and postgraduates. A summary of discussions is presented at the next EDIC meeting and online *(BA6.3, BA9.1, BA11.3)*.

**The EDIC organised Staff and Student Surveys** (SSS), which were analysed by an external consultant. The most recent SSS analysis, the EDIC’s response to it, and the ongoing Action Plan is on the external website. SBS staff can also communicate anonymously via the EDIC website reporting form.

*Surveys held in December 2016 and 2017* included PS staff as well as academic staff and PGs (in contrast to the 2014 SSS, which included academics and PGs only). All comparisons between 2014 and 2016/7 SSS are restricted to academic staff and PGs.
97% and 87% of staff and students completed these surveys in 2016 and 2017 respectively, compared to 44% in 2014 (BA1.3). This is testament to high levels of engagement with Athena SWAN.

In addition to consultation, impact of EDI actions is assessed through data monitoring. The SBS administrative team summarises feedback from Exit Interviews annually (BA6.2), and annual data requests are sent to UoB HR, Staff Student data reporting, and the NSS for key metrics analysed in Section 4 and 5, and a report generated by an external consultant (BA1.4).

Focus groups have revised key SBS policy. For example, special FGs with PGs and international PGs in Jan 2018 led to the establishment of social media groups for statistics and R programming, and additional actions to improve PG support (AP5.1-3).

The SBS committed financial (£4K p.a) and staff support to 5 bespoke in-house training sessions (e.g. in appropriate behaviour, unconscious bias), refreshments at 12 EDIC focus discussion groups, 3 ECR Careers Days, 6 PG and UG alumni events.

Consultation with individuals outside SBS

UoB-wide Interactions: The EDI Chair and former HoS attend Faculty EDIC meetings. The EDI Chair discussed our EDI plans with the Vice Chancellor in 2017, and the incoming LSF Dean in 2018. Information is shared across Schools to maximise momentum on key issues (e.g. with Earth Sciences to standardise parental leave in 2016).

EDIC Consultation outside UoB: The EDIC Chair has four meetings per year with Biological Sciences EDIC members at York (Gold), Liverpool (Gold), Exeter (Silver) and UCL (Bronze). The DC has consulted with Zoology at Cambridge (Silver). In addition, the Chair and DC attend NERC GW4 AS meetings (with Bath, Cardiff, Exeter).

“The culture of the School has changed hugely in the past few years. It feels like a variety of views and ways of thinking are being included now in how the School is being run”; “[There is] improved communication and inclusion of all staff groups in School decisions” (Academic staff, SSS, 2017).

(iii) Plans for the future of the self-assessment team

In 2018-22, the EDIC will evaluate the progress of our ongoing actions and revise them where necessary using the consultation mechanisms described above.

Consultation with the new LSF: The EDIC will consult with the LSF Director to ensure EDI issues are prioritised in plans for the new Faculty, especially where structural changes beyond the SBS are necessary (e.g. AP8.2).

The HoS will represent EDI issues at Faculty HoS meetings, and the EDIC Chair and Prof. Memmott will retain their positions on the EDIC and Gender Equality Committee of the new Faculty. All SBS Staff will be invited to EDI discussion meetings during the 2018 formation of the new LSF.

(1022 words)
4. A PICTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT
Recommended word count: Bronze: 2000 words | Silver: 2000 words

4.1. Student DATA
If courses in the categories below do not exist, please enter n/a.

(i) Numbers of men and women on access or foundation course
n/a

(ii) Numbers of undergraduate students by gender
Full- and part-time by programme. Provide data on course applications, offers, and acceptance rates, and degree attainment by gender.

Undergraduates on full-time degrees: Two degrees are offered: Biology and Zoology (BSc), although they only diverge in student choices at L3, and transfer between them is possible until that time.

Both courses were extended in 2013/4 to include an optional 4th year (MSci degree), which can be joined in L1, or transferred to before L3. The total number of students taking an undergraduate degree (Biology BSc and MSci, Zoology BSc and MSci) has increased from 448 in 2013/14 to 596 in 2016/17.

Increasing female proportions on Biology/Zoology degrees: Approximately 20% of BSc students (150/707 in 2016/17) are registered for Zoology rather than Biology, with typically 10% more females studying Zoology at a given time (e.g. 69% vs 59% female) (Table 2). This difference is not seen in UK benchmarking data (Figure 5).

The proportions of females on both degrees has consistently increased overall (and in both degrees equally) from 56 to 61% since 2013/4, although the proportion of females registered for the MSci has fluctuated.

Transfer onto MSci is a key route for progression onto postgraduate study, and was promoted and quantified (BA3.1, BA3.2). The percentage of females who transfer to the MSci during their degree is similar to the percentage in undergraduate intake: 2013/4: 57% (16/28); 2015/6, 58% (14/24); 2016/7: 68% (30/44).
Figure 5. Total number of undergraduate students (Biology and Zoology) per year.

Table 2. Total number of undergraduate students in Zoology and Biology per year, and % in each course that on the 4-year MSci option (introduced in 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>BSc Female</th>
<th>MSci Female</th>
<th>% MSci Female</th>
<th>BSc Male</th>
<th>MSci Male</th>
<th>% MSci Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduates on part-time degrees: Part-time degrees make it easier for students with caring responsibilities or financial constraints to complete degrees. The facility to study part time is promoted in recruitment material. However, the number of undergraduates taking part-time degrees is relatively low (c. 5% in a given year). The number of female part-time students (out of all part-time students) has declined from
6/10 in 2014/15 to 3/7 in 2016/17, although the numbers are too small to draw reliable conclusions.

**Intersectionality:** The proportion of BAME undergraduate students is low, at about 10% per year for Biology, between 12-20% for Zoology. This is lower than the national average for Biology, but higher than that for Zoology (Figure 6).

- **AP1.1: Evaluate issues affecting BAME undergraduate and postgraduate attainment in Biology and Zoology in SBS compared with other Schools across the new LSF (and the UK), using longitudinal and clustering analyses of student profiles and NSS feedback.**

![Figure 6. Total number and proportion of BAME undergraduates (Zoology and Biology) in 2016-17.](chart)

**Application success rates:** The percentage female undergraduate intake has increased from 56–63% since 2013/4 and is close to the UK HESA average. In every year, higher proportions of women apply and receive offers than men. Since females or males do not seem systematically favoured at the selection, application or acceptance stage (Table 3), we will gather data on any gender differences affecting student choices.

- **AP2.1: Understand why there is a declining proportion of males on BSc Biology and Zoology courses at Bristol:** Gather more detailed data and feedback on the applications and acceptance rates of male and female UGs, and at induction and graduation.
Table 3. Applications, offers and intake for Biology and Zoology degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Actual Intake</th>
<th>% Offers from Applications</th>
<th>% Intake from Offers</th>
<th>% Intake from Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>606 (57%)</td>
<td>464 (59%)</td>
<td>92 (56%)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>448 (43%)</td>
<td>325 (41%)</td>
<td>73 (44%)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>666 (60%)</td>
<td>574 (60%)</td>
<td>138 (61%)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>443 (40%)</td>
<td>375 (40%)</td>
<td>88 (39%)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>879 (60%)</td>
<td>661 (62%)</td>
<td>128 (60%)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>589 (40%)</td>
<td>412 (38%)</td>
<td>87 (40%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>834 (60%)</td>
<td>692 (60%)</td>
<td>150 (63%)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>554 (40%)</td>
<td>456 (40%)</td>
<td>87 (37%)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>5019</td>
<td>3959</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2985 (59%)</td>
<td>2391 (60%)</td>
<td>508 (60%)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2034 (41%)</td>
<td>1568 (40%)</td>
<td>335 (40%)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Degree attainment:** We observe little difference across 2014–2017 between female and male students in the percentage that attain a 2.1 or higher (females either do better, in 2014 and 2015, or achieve similar grades, in 2013 and 2017). These values are similar to national benchmarking (e.g. more females attain 2.1 or higher, HESA 2016/17 data) although the overall scores are higher in SBS than national average (Figure 7). Similarly, there was little gender difference in the percentage of students who suspended their degrees across the same period (8/335 or 2.4% males, 19/508 or 3.7% females) or who withdrew from the degree programme (28/335 or 8.4% males, versus 32/508 or 6.3% females).

A consistently higher proportion of students on the MSci degrees obtain 1st Class and 2.1 degrees (with no students attaining 2.2 or lower in the 3 years it has run). This could be explained by: (a) the minimum degree requirement to transfer to or remain on an MSci degree; or (b) potentially higher motivation of MSci students and the more research-focused content of the fourth year of UG study. However, there are no consistent gender differences in attainment.
Figure 7. Degree class awarded by gender (Zoology and Biology combined); The MSc was introduced in 2014.

**Awareness of gender issues:** We present appropriate and inclusive female and male images in promotional materials, e.g. prospectuses (Fig 8), and provide links and material on unconscious bias on induction (BA13.2).

We introduced gender equality into undergraduate teaching in 2014 (BA13.1), including a compulsory first-year lecture on gender in science. Unconscious bias is explored throughout L2 and 3, for example during statistical tutorials.

**Extension of blind marking:** All second- and third-year project work and all exam papers are submitted electronically and marked blind to prevent unconscious bias (BA13.3). Although this is not possible for continuous assessment, more than one academic provides feedback, and PGs and PDRAs are also consulted to moderate one academic opinion.
(iii) **Numbers of men and women on postgraduate taught degrees**

Full- and part-time. Provide data on course application, offers and acceptance rates and degree completion rates by gender.

N/a (the part-time taught postgraduate MSc course was discontinued in 2013/14).

(iv) **Numbers of men and women on postgraduate research degrees**

Full- and part-time. Provide data on course application, offers, acceptance and degree completion rates by gender.

In 2016/17 there were 74 SBS PhD students and 25 MRes students (Fig 8). The percentage female PhD students varied between 49% in 2015/16 and 57% in 2016/17, slightly lower than the national HESA average, with no consistent change across years. The percentage of females is higher at MRes (63% 4-year average) than PhD (52% 4-year average) level.
Increased proportion of part time postgraduates: Since 2015, we have promoted awareness of the benefits of part-time postgraduate study during annual reviews and induction (BA4.3), and through blogs by part-time postgraduates on the EDIC website (BA4.2). The number of students taking postgraduate degrees part-time remains low but has increased from 5/89 (5%) in 2013/14 to 11/98 (11%) in 2015/16 and 2016/17.

While the percentage of non-white students at MRes level is very low (only 1/25 in total in 2016/17), there are more BAME students at PhD level (up to 40% of 27 male students in 2016/17) (Figure 10) (AP1.1).
Since 2013, SBS has consistently offered more PhD places to women than to men (Table 4 and Fig 12), despite more applications coming from men (e.g. 40% of applications but 50% of offers were from/to females in 2016-7; Figure 11). Female students are also more likely on average to accept PhD offers at SBS than males, possibly because males make more speculative applications for (unfunded) PhD positions.

In any case, higher success rates for females relative to males (assuming our selection post-application is not gender biased) suggests a pool of women who are suitable for interview but do not apply for positions.

- **AP2.2: Increase female application rates to SBS postgraduate and academic positions.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year / Programme / Gender</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Actual Intake</th>
<th>% Offers from Applications</th>
<th>% Intake from Offers</th>
<th>% Intake from Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science (MRes)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences (PhD)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science (MRes)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences (PhD)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science (MRes)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences (PhD)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science (MRes)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences (PhD)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11. Percentage females who applied, were offered and were admitted as MRes students at SBS between 2013 and 2016.

Figure 12. Percentage females who applied, were offered and were admitted as PhD students at SBS between 2013 and 2016.

(v) **Progression pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate student levels**

Identify and comment on any issues in the pipeline between undergraduate and postgraduate degrees.
Progression from undergraduate to postgraduate study: Figure 13 suggests that the proportion of females is consistently lower in SBS at PhD than at MRes or undergraduate level, but remains equal to or higher than 50%.

However, female SBS undergraduates are more likely than males to progress to postgraduate study, associated with Bronze actions to promote female postgraduate study (BA3.1, BA6.1). Of the 2014/15 cohort of Biology and Zoology BSc graduates, 53 and 14 respectively moved on to postgraduate study, of whom 58% and 71% were female. For the MSci students (combined), 12 progressed to postgraduate study, of which 67% were female. Of the MRes students, 13 went on to do PhDs (62% female).

4.2. Academic and research staff data
(i) Academic staff by grade, contract function and gender: research-only, teaching and research or teaching-only

Look at the career pipeline and comment on and explain any differences between men and women. Identify any gender issues in the pipeline at particular grades/job type/academic contract type.

BA1.1 improved and standardised the quality of staff data collated by the UoB for Athena SWAN applications. However, these improvements began in 2014/15, so staff data are only available for three years (compared to four for student data).
Table 5: Role titles and associated grades for UoB academic staff career pathways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pathway 1: Research and Teaching</th>
<th>Pathway 2: Research Only</th>
<th>Pathway 3: Teaching Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>Teaching Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Senior Research Associate</td>
<td>Senior Teaching Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer/Reader</td>
<td>Senior Research Fellow/Reader</td>
<td>Senior Teaching Fellow/Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of females in the academic staff has remained approximately constant (34-36%) from 2014-17, lower than the sector average (44%). There are slightly more females on research-and-teaching contracts in 2016/17 than 2014/15 (21% versus 18%), although this is lower than the sector average (38%). By contrast, the proportion of females on research-only contracts has remained approximately constant and is closer to the sector average (Table 6, Fig 14).

![Figure 14](image_url) Academic staff on research and teaching (R & T), research only (R) or teaching-only contracts (T). Teaching-only contracts (introduced in 2015) are included for illustration, given very low sample sizes.

Table 6: Academic staff on research and teaching, research only, or teaching-only contracts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014-15 Female</th>
<th>2014-15 Male</th>
<th>2015-16 Female</th>
<th>2015-16 Male</th>
<th>2016-17 Female</th>
<th>2016-17 Male</th>
<th>HESA 2016-17 Female</th>
<th>HESA 2016-17 Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and Teaching</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
<td>27 (82%)</td>
<td>5 (16%)</td>
<td>26 (84%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
<td>27 (79%)</td>
<td>2760 (38%)</td>
<td>4480 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Only</td>
<td>18 (49%)</td>
<td>19 (51%)</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
<td>17 (47%)</td>
<td>19 (53%)</td>
<td>5345 (52%)</td>
<td>4945 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>5310 (58%)</td>
<td>3800 (42%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 10% of staff work part-time; of which 32% are female, lower than the sector average (59% female; Table 7). However, low numbers make this difficult to interpret.

**Table 7**: Academic staff on part-time or full-time contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Part-Time</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Part-Time</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8**: Academic staff by grade and contract function (Pathway 1,2). Pathway 3 is excluded given low numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Both research and teaching</th>
<th>Research Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J: Research Associate</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J: Lecturer, Senior</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/L: (Senior) Lecturer</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Senior) Research</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow, Reader</td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been an increase in the proportion of female PDRAs (55-65%) and Research Fellows/Readers (21-26%) since 2014 (Table 8, Figure 15), and a transformation from the “top heavy male” character of the School in 2012-3. We also recently appointed two female Proleptic Fellows/Senior Lecturers, who started in 2017-8 (not shown).

The proportion of female Professors has gone from 20-17% because male numbers have increased at this grade (2 males and 1 female were made Professor in 2017).

This shift in the composition and culture of the School is associated with our Bronze Actions (detailed in relevant sections below) to improve: (i) mentoring to encourage promotion; (ii) support for returners from parental leave; (iii) training for career development and grant success; (iv) Female recruitment via Fellowships and the Exceptional Talent Route; (v) workload quality assessment and (vi) the regular rotation of admin jobs and committee membership.
Figure 15. Academic pipeline: percentage of female academic staff in SBS by Grade (K/L are combined because K numbers are small). Numbers refer to average total number of staff since 2014. HESA benchmarking is for grade equivalents in UK Biosciences estimated using salary bands.

Our future actions to promote female transition from fixed-term to open-ended positions include:

- AP2.2: Increase female application rates to SBS academic positions
- AP2.3: Introduce promotion and CV workshops for all academic staff
- AP4.2: Increase and extend the use of External Mentors and mentoring circles
- AP4.3: Provide additional “career mentor for grant-funded staff”, distinct from research line manager, to support grant and fellowship applications (including to overseas destinations)
- AP4.4: Career workshops to encourage learning from rejection, and developing transferrable skills in science
- AP5.6: Improved recognition and opportunities for teaching and mentoring for PDRAs

(ii) Academic and research staff by grade on fixed-term, open-ended/permanent and zero-hour contracts by gender

Comment on the proportions of men and women on these contracts. Comment on what is being done to ensure continuity of employment and to address any other issues, including redeployment schemes.
No academic or research staff are on zero-hour contracts. However, 78 postgraduate students (62% female) are paid an hourly rate to give undergraduate tutorials and demonstrate in practicals.

Fixed-term contracts apply primarily to grant-funded PDRAs or technicians, who are employed by academic staff on open-ended contracts to complete a particular scientific project (the majority of “Research Only” positions in Table 9).

Since 2014, the proportion (and number) of females on fixed-term contracts has fallen from 61% to 47%, reflecting an increase in female research-only fellows with open-ended contracts (i.e. proleptic lectureships).

Female academic staff are also more likely to be on fixed-term contracts than males, at grade I/J (Table 10 and Fig 16). Again, this reflects the lower proportion of female research fellows and is lower than the UK benchmark, possibly because of the low numbers of (open-ended) teaching-only fellows at SBS compared to UK Universities.

Table 9: Fixed-Term and Open-Ended Contract Staff by Career Path and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teaching &amp; Research</th>
<th>Research Only</th>
<th>Teaching Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed-Term</td>
<td>Open-Ended</td>
<td>% Fixed-Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Fixed-Term and Open-Ended Contract Staff by grade and gender in 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Fixed-Term</th>
<th>Open-Ended</th>
<th>% Fixed-Term</th>
<th>Fixed-Term</th>
<th>Open-Ended</th>
<th>% Fixed-Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16. Academic staff on fixed-term and open-ended contracts.

The **UoB Redeployment Policy** means all staff at the end of fixed-term contracts of more than two years can join a ‘redeployment pool’. Where there is a match between an at-risk candidate and the criteria for a role, the local candidate will be interviewed, using the University's standard recruitment process.

**Local actions to promote re-employment**: most academic staff move to other Universities after their fixed-term contract, meaning the redeployment scheme rarely benefits them.

The **SBS therefore provides additional support** to develop transferable skills ([BA10.1](#)), including support in writing job and fellowship applications, and hosting mock interview panels.

(iii) **Academic leavers by grade and gender and full/part-time status**

Comment on the reasons academic staff leave the department, any differences by gender and the mechanisms for collecting this data.

Staff turnover within the School is higher on research-only contracts (28% leave across years 2014–17) than research and teaching contracts (5% left in same period). Of research-only staff, a consistently higher percentage of males leave than females (e.g. 6/15 versus 4/17 in 2016/17, Table 11).

This suggests that female PDRAs are more likely than males to remain employed at SBS. The numbers leaving on research-and-teaching and teaching-only contracts is too low to consider gender differences.

In 2014-7, only two part-time staff left (1 research-only, 1 research-and-teaching, Table 12), and – while most (13/29) leavers were at grade I – there were instances of leavers in all other grades (Table 13).
Exit questionnaire: BA6.2 introduced an anonymous online exit questionnaire, sent to all staff on leaving, to reflect on their experiences in SBS and reasons for leaving. Responses indicate that most staff leave because fixed-term contracts end without ongoing local funding. Those on open-ended contracts typically leave to take up positions at other Universities.

Owing to low leaver numbers, and low questionnaire response rate, data were not sufficient to analyse gender differences in reasons for leaving, despite providing important qualitative data on SBS career support.

- AP1.2: Improve collation of data from questionnaire procedure and increase uptake and information provided by SBS leavers

Table 11: Leavers and Leaving Rates for Staff by Career Path and Gender (Pathway 3 staff excluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th></th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th></th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>5 (31%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>2 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Teaching</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (NA)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Leavers and Leaving Rates for Staff on by Pathway and Part/Time status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>8 (21%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>1 (NA)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Leavers</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Leavers and Leaving Rates for Staff by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Staff 2014/15</th>
<th>Staff 2015/16</th>
<th>Staff 2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (26%)</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
<td>2 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M: Professor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1781 words)
5. SUPPORTING AND ADVANCING WOMEN’S CAREERS
Recommended word count: Bronze: 6000 words | Silver: 6500 words

5.1. Key career transition points: academic staff

(i) Recruitment

Break down data by gender and grade for applications to academic posts including shortlisted candidates, offer and acceptance rates. Comment on how the department’s recruitment processes ensure that women (and men where there is an underrepresentation in numbers) are encouraged to apply.

We have introduced training in recruitment and unconscious bias and formalized much of the recruitment procedure to improve inclusivity (BA13.3; BA7.2).

Training in recruitment is mandatory for all staff conducting recruitment. In November 2016, SBS held a compulsory unconscious bias training session (BA7.2, BA13.3). The EDI website hosts online tools to test such bias, and to remove gender biases in recruitment text.

For all SBS positions, female and male applicants are shortlisted separately and then combined for second shortlisting (BA7.2).

All academic staff are appointed using interview panels of at least three members of staff, with a gender ratio reflecting SBS (at least 30% female) (BA7.3). To reduce overburdening of senior female staff, female ECRs can be brought onto panels.

The School helps applicants with caring responsibilities by rescheduling and rearranging interviews, especially for senior positions where extended visits allow many staff to meet applicants and contribute to selection.

“My interview coincided with the birth of my second child. I almost withdrew, but the School was accommodating about adjusting the schedule: I had a preliminary Skype discussion and a follow-up interview when I could travel. My husband and baby came, we were welcomed warmly and given a private room so I could take breaks during the schedule” (interviewee, 2017).
Table 14: Male and female applicants, shortlisted and successful for research positions in SBS between 2014 and 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>% of applicants shortlisted</th>
<th>% of those made shortlisted successful</th>
<th>% of applicants successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18 (46%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (58%)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21 (54%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>5 (42%)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>62 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (58%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (42%)</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88 (35%)</td>
<td>20 (51%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>164 (65%)</td>
<td>19 (49%)</td>
<td>6 (46%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>168 (40%)</td>
<td>39 (53%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>248 (60%)</td>
<td>35 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Application, shortlisting, and success by % female across years

Table 14 and 15 suggest that Bronze Actions have increased the shortlisting and interview success for female applicants. However, as with PhD recruitment, the increased probability of shortlisting for females who apply compared to males suggests a pool of suitable female applicants whom our adverts do not attract. Note that this assumes shortlisting and interviewing are not biased against males. However, we are confident this is the case due to separate gender shortlisting, and representative interview panels.

This pattern is especially clear for PI positions (Figure 18), albeit based on one 2017 recruitment round. We have not appointed at a level higher than K since 2014, so these grades are absent.

- AP2.2: Increase female application rates to SBS postgraduate and academic positions by: (a) advertising provision for carers; (b) making the use of on-line gender-neutral tools mandatory (c) proactively identifying strong female candidates and encouraging them to apply for PI positions.
Table 15: Recruitment of male and female academic staff (2014–2017) depending on grade: K (Lecturer/Senior Lecturer) or I/J (PDRA or STA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Shortlisted</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>% of applicants shortlisted</th>
<th>% of those made shortlisted successful</th>
<th>% of applicants successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade K</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59 (36%)</td>
<td>8 (62%)</td>
<td>3 (75%)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>106 (64%)</td>
<td>5 (38%)</td>
<td>1 (25%)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades I/J</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>109 (43%)</td>
<td>31 (51%)</td>
<td>17 (59%)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>142 (57%)</td>
<td>30 (49%)</td>
<td>12 (41%)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18. Recruitment by job role type (K: Lecturer/Senior lecturer; I/J: PDRA or STA) during 2014-7, % of each gender.

(ii) Induction

Describe the induction and support provided to all new academic staff at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

BA10.2 standardised and monitored the induction and welcoming process for all new academic staff, via an online induction checklist. Completion is checked and signed off by the administrative team. Of academic staff who started in the past 4 years, the induction process was completed by 100% of males (11/11) and 71% of females (20/28).

- AP3.1: Further increase induction uptake among new female academic staff

Mandatory mentoring training for line managers and PIs (BA11.6) highlights their responsibility to mentor new staff, introduce them to peers and support career development.
New academic staff are:

- Sent a link to the induction checklist and Staff Handbook.
- Introduced to administration support, the HoS, SM, and their line manager, with whom logistical support, flexible working and behaviour policy are discussed (BA19.2).
- Informed of mandatory training, Staff Development courses; pastoral support (e.g. the Work and Family initiative; BA19.4), social events and email groups.
- Assigned two mentors and lab partners within two weeks of starting (BA8.3)
- Asked to provide a photo/biography in the SBS Newsletter.
- Give a Round Table seminar on their research within six months
- Given a six- and twelve-month review with their line manager, monitored via ‘Initial Service Review’ feedback to HR.

The admin team check completion of the induction checklist, and request feedback. In general, feedback is positive and SBS policy has changed as a result: our family room for carers are now specifically highlighted in induction. The induction handbook is regularly updated by feedback, e.g. adding an explanation of SBS abbreviations.

Figure 19. Welcome for new staff in SBS Newsletter
To diversify social networks across SBS, a “buddy bench” was trialled in the coffee room in Autumn 2017. This is a designated table where all staff are encouraged to mix across groups and roles. SSS feedback on this was very positive.

- **AP4.2(iv): Reintroduce the “Buddy Bench” to diversify connections between PG, PDRAs and other PIs, and between academic and PS staff.**

SSS feedback suggested **overseas arrivals can need additional support** due to language or cultural differences, separation from family, or different induction times to UK postgraduates (**AP5.3**). They are advised of help available from PSS in e.g. arranging bank accounts and tenancy agreements.

**To assist new PIs** in forming inter-disciplinary links for grant applications, UoB events introduce the four cross-Faculty **UoB Research Institutes**, and workshops and foster new collaborations. These are advertised by email and on the SBS website.

(iii) **Promotion**

Provide data on staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

All tenured staff below Professor are eligible for promotion, and are encouraged and supported in the following ways:
Promotion or progression is raised for all eligible staff at each APR review (BA8.6) as well as during informal meetings with mentors (BA8.3). Guidance is provided on promotion assessment, and criteria used (also available online).

The APR assesses the quality as well as quantity of workload to ensure promotion opportunities are as equitable as possible and advises the HoS on modifying workload appropriately.

All eligible staff are emailed for each promotion round, and Faculty Promotion workshops advertised that advise on the process (BA8.2). Reviewers are encouraged to approach eligible staff, based on the promotion plan agreed in their APR.

Staff applying for promotion submit their application to the Internal Promotion Committee, comprising senior staff and the HoS, who suggest revisions before submission to Faculty. Stress is given to highlighting career breaks, which are now formally included in assessment (BA19.5).

If the committee decide promotion is unlikely, the HoS meets the applicant (BA8.7) and discusses adjusting their workload to achieve CV improvements (e.g. extra writing time or altered committee membership). This is advisory: candidates advised to delay their application are still free to apply.

A Faculty Promotion panel considers applications on the advice of external expert reviewers. To counter self-undervaluation, the Faculty can award promotion at a higher level than applied for.

These actions have meant: (a) that women are now more likely than men to apply for promotion (Figure 21, Table 16) and (b) are more successful when they apply (Figure 21, Table 16). This reflects a positive effect of pro-active mentoring (e.g. Case study 2) and a reluctance for female staff to put forward speculative applications. Also, fewer men are applying for promotion (and those that do are slightly less successful than females). Again, this may reflect more effective mentoring.

Increased understanding of promotion and reduced gender gap: In 2014, 63% of male and 19% of female academic staff were “familiar with the procedures for promotion”; in 2017 this had risen to 91% and 67% respectively. In 2014, 41% of men and 81% of women had “never put themselves forward for promotion”. In 2017 this had fallen to 29% and 41% respectively (SSS).

Pro-active mentoring is now responsible for 60% of promotion applications. Of 45 people applying for promotion in 2016/7, 18 made the decision independently, 8 were encouraged by the HoS, 7 by their line manager, 5 by a mentor, and 13 by others (SSS).

- AP4.1: Introduce promotion and CV workshops for all eligible academic staff: we will (a) provide annual CV surgeries and (b) the Senior Management Team will offer to provide feedback on CVs from all eligible staff each year to advise on promotion applications
Figure 21. Numbers and outcomes of applicants who applied for promotion

Table 16: Success of promotion applications by gender 2014-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Application Rate</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Department submissions to the Research Excellence Framework (REF)

Provide data on the staff, by gender, submitted to REF versus those that were eligible. Compare this to the data for the Research Assessment Exercise 2008. Comment on any gender imbalances identified.

In the 2008 RAE, 4/4 eligible female and 29/30 male researchers were submitted. In the 2014 REF, 8/8 eligible female and 29/30 eligible male researchers were submitted, indicating no gender bias for REF submissions.
5.2 Key career transition points: professional and support staff

(i) Induction

Describe the induction and support provided to all new professional and support staff, at all levels. Comment on the uptake of this and how its effectiveness is reviewed.

(ii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion, and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

PSS go through the same induction as academic staff (section 5.1(i), apart from being assigned lab partners and giving a Round Table talk.

PSS are also given a one-week timetable ahead of arrival, including scheduled times for meeting key staff and training, and additional PSS induction feedback form.

Of PSS who started since 2014, 92% females completed the induction (12/13) and 67% males (2/3).

Feedback on induction is very positive, with induction revised based on suggestions e.g. for more detail on School structure and different academic roles.

(ii) Promotion

Provide data on staff applying for promotion, and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status. Comment on how staff are encouraged and supported through the process.

PSS do not have formal promotion procedures within SBS; instead, they can apply for newly advertised posts at higher grades, which are advertised internally first through the deployment pool. Grade re-evaluation is possible through a formal HR procedure, but uptake of this process is low.

- AP6.1: Increase and better advertise opportunities for PSS career progression and promotion including the possibility of grade re-evaluation, better cross-
School mentoring, and awareness of positions opening in other Schools in the Faculty

5.3 Career development: academic staff

(i) Training

Describe the training available to staff at all levels in the department. Provide details of uptake by gender and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

The UoB CREATE scheme offers professional training for academic staff in e.g. effective teaching and mentoring, managing conflict, research supervision, and policy impact.

The completion of 14 CREATE modules over two years (from a choice of c. 50 units covering research, mentoring and teaching skills) is mandatory for new Lecturers to be promoted. There is also the option to train for a formal Teaching Qualification.

Additional Faculty training is promoted via email and the EDI Bulletin (BA10.1).

The SBS also funds bespoke courses depending on needs identified during APRs, the SSS and EDIC Focus Groups (e.g. “Scientific Writing” and “Effective Time Management” in 2016 and 2017).

There has been an increase in the training courses attended by academic staff: 39 in 2014/15 (56% by females); 76 in 2015/16 (58% by females); 109 in 2016/7 (45% by females). However, females are still more supportive of training (75% vs 54% of men; 2017 SSS).

(ii) Appraisal/development review

Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for staff at all levels, including postdoctoral researchers and provide data on uptake by gender. Provide details of any appraisal/review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.

Appraisal and career development for academic staff is through the Annual Performance Review (APR). Its use has increased dramatically since 2014 (BA8.6).

The APR includes: (1) taking stock of objectives for the previous year, (2) reflecting on achievements or successes, (3) identifying training needs and skills not being fully used, (4) planning ahead, and identifying objectives for the coming period. This includes promotion objectives (see above).

The APR also covers workload: the reviewee can declare activities crucial to their development that too small or externally-facing to be captured by the WAM.

Mandatory training (e.g. in Equality and Diversity, and Supporting Vulnerable Students) is delivered to staff as part of their APR.
In 2014, only 69% of male and 50% of female academic staff had an APR that year (SSS); in 2018, 76% of male and 88% of female academic staff have completed their APR.

In 2014, EDIC focus groups stated that APRs were not sufficiently formalised. In 2016, 63% of men and 65% of women found more formalised reviews “helpful” or “very helpful”; 79% overall said they helped them understand expectations (SSS).

- **AP4.1**: Increase APR completion further, especially by PDRAs by promoting the use by Skype where staff are away from UoB (e.g. working in the field) for extended periods.

(iii) **Support given to academic staff for career progression**

Comment and reflect on support given to academic staff, especially postdoctoral researchers, to assist in their career progression.

All open-contract academic staff are appointed two mentors, in addition to their line manager (who conducts their APR) (BA8.3).

During mentoring discussions, staff who have: (a) remained at a grade for >5 years; (b) had repeated unsuccessful promotion or grant applications, or (c) recently increased caring responsibilities are supported in activities such as grant or paper writing by mentors recommending reduced administrative duties to the HoS.

**Career training in mentoring and research management is encouraged (BA11.6)**, including the Aurora Leadership Course for women, and UoB Management Courses. Since 2015, 47% of academic staff taking such courses were female.

**New PIs** are given a reduced teaching/admin load in their first year to focus on developing their research group and funding.

The Faculty organise **mock interviews and grant panels (BA8.2)**, and attendance encouraged. The School’s P德拉 representatives organise **annual ECR Careers Days** (39 attendees in 2017; 89% found the day ‘extremely useful’). ECRs also prepared an online guide “how to get a fellowship” based on their own experiences (BA8.1).

**PIs are asked about their mentoring approach and responsibilities to PDRAs during APRs**, including assisting with fellowship and grant applications, their scientific service (e.g. Manuscript reviewing), and conference attendance. Two SBS PIs have won international recognition for their mentoring skills (Profs Innes Cuthill, Nature Award 2005, and Jane Memmott, celebrated on Rapid Ecology blog, 2018).

**PDRAs are supported in applying for research fellowships and academic jobs (BA6.3)** by bespoke mock interviews, and internal peer review. In 2015-8, SBS supported 5/17 (29%) successful female applications; and 5/26 (19%) successful male applications for UK fellowships. Faculty Staff advise on fellowships for overseas applicants (e.g. for incoming EU Fellowships; 7/21 applications successful since 2014).
Of 52 PDRAs in 2015-8; 18/23 (78%) females and 17/29 (59%) males moved on to another PDRA position.

**External Mentors were introduced in 2015 (BA16.2).** These are ex-UoB academic staff who host in-house appointments with academic staff and PGs, promoted by email, posters, and online. They provide career and well-being support, and report issues anonymously to the SEA and EDIC.

**However, uptake of EMs remains low.** Only 5% of PDRAs and PhD students made an appointment to see an EM during 2017, although others may have used the open sessions. Feedback from ECRs suggested diversifying the EMs to non-UK backgrounds, as well as non-academic roles

- AP4.2: Increase and extend the use of External Mentors by: (a) increasing their diversity in role and age; (b) introducing them at PhD and PDRA events as well as at induction, and promote their use by email, allowing the potential for ECR mentors who have moved from UoB e.g. to Fellowships overseas.

**We have seen clear improvements from actions since 2014:** In 2014, only 60% of men and 38% of women felt they received effective career support. In 2017 this had risen to 70% of men and 63% of women (SSS).

---

**Tom Williams**  
*Royal Society URF 2015-20; now proleptic Senior Lecturer*  
“Staff in the LSB provided a lot of support during my URF and NERC fellowship applications, including detailed feedback on the applications, one-on-one advice on preparing talks, and mock interviews, and a course in presentation and interview skills, which was extremely valuable.”

**Orly Ragzour**  
*PhD student 2009-2012; NERC Fellowship 2015-20; now Lecturer, University of Southampton*  
“My NERC Fellowship application received really helpful comments from reviewers in SBS, and access to previous applications. These helped me gain a broader perspective. The training and mock interviews made me feel more confident throughout the whole process.”

**Andrew Griffiths**  
*Senior Teaching Associate 2014-15; winner of 2015 University Teaching Award; now Lecturer, University of Exeter*  
“Bristol gave me the space to concentrate on my teaching practice, and work on my Fellowship of the HEA. This helped build my CV and made me competitive for further academic positions.”

**Ulrike Bauer**  
*Leverhulme Fellow 2014-7; Royal Society URF 2017-22*  
“In 2013 I had really great support from staff to prepare my application, and helping me to settle in. In 2016, the support was much more formalised, with training courses and mock interviews and internal reviews. I’m now getting invaluable help in hiring my first PhD students”

---

**Figure 22.** Exporting and importing scientific talent: ECRs who have been supported in joining or leaving SBS via Fellowships or Lectureships
**Feedback on mentoring:** 79% of staff on fixed-term contracts requested more one-to-one mentoring, compared to 39% of open-contract staff (2017 SSS). PDRA Focus groups (BA9.1) revealed three key difficulties during the critical transition to independent researcher:

1. Effective time management, particularly near the contract end when conflicts can arise between research and job/fellowship applications.
2. Maintaining mental well-being, especially resilience when dealing with rejection.
3. Developing CVs to include transferable skills, teaching/lecturing, impact, networking and collaborations.

**Actions to address these issues will include:**

- **AP4.3:** Provide additional “career mentor for grant-funded staff”, distinct from research line manager, to support grant and fellowship applications (including to overseas destinations)
- **AP4.4:** Career workshops to encourage learning from rejection, and developing transferrable skills in science
- **AP4.5:** Improved recognition and opportunities for teaching and mentoring for PDRAs, including giving research seminars to undergraduates that supplement L3 lecture courses (with UG feedback)

**Support given to students (at any level) for academic career progression**

Comment and reflect on support given to students at any level to enable them to make informed decisions about their career (including the transition to a sustainable academic career).

PGs and UGs are offered comprehensive training courses in SBS, and Personal Development Plans, focusing on effective study techniques, and mental well-being.

**Undergraduates receive career support from tutors,** including termly one-to-one tutorials (BA5.2) where they are asked about work experience plans, and supported in identifying summer studentships. The second-year “Science and Success” module gives advice on STEM careers, and CV and interview techniques. An UG sits on the EDIC and holds termly meetings with Level1-4 undergraduate representatives (BA5.1).

**Postgraduates** have at least one primary and secondary supervisor, and two assessors who interview them annually via the **APM** system. In addition, a Graduate Tutor, and Graduate Research committee oversees PG issues and liaise with Graduate Representatives. **Postgraduates also have access to External Mentors (BA9.2)**

For each APM, PGs submit a report, and discuss progress, training and career needs with their assessors. PGs are asked to reflect on supervisory support, and additional training needed. The gender balance of assessors is close to that of academic staff (27% female).
Each meeting is summarised by an online form, commented on by the student, assessors, supervisors, and the Graduate Dean. **BA8.6** dramatically increased the regularity of these APMs.

In 2014, 13% of male and 20% of female PGs had an APM. By 2017, this had risen to 100% of men and 96% of women (**SSS**). The % of PGs that found the APM “helpful” or “very helpful” increased from 36% of men and 62% of women in 2014 to 76% of men and 67% of women in 2017.

**Supervisors receive mandatory training** (**BA11.6**) in effective mentoring and dealing with vulnerable students, to improve feedback delivery.

A **written code of conduct** was produced in 2016 for PGs and supervisors summarising minimum frequency of contact, support expected from the supervisor and the responsibilities of the PhD student.

**Financial support is available for postgraduates** to attend conferences, and **mentoring support** for policy/industry internship and small grants critical for career development (4 female and 3 male PGs have been policy interns since 2015).

**Parental leave support for all UoB PhD students:** After a long campaign involving our former and incoming HoSs, funding was made available in 2018 for parental leave for UoB PhD students to match RCUK students.

More postgraduates now report that they receive effective career support, from 56% of men and 52% of women in 2014, to 67% 75% respectively in 2016 (**SSS**).

**During 2015-8,** 31/41 (76%) female PhD students went on to a PDRA position compared to 20/33 (62%) males.

**Career advice is offered during annual alumni events** (**BA5.1**) for UGs and PGs, and a training module “What to do with a PG degree in biology”. 18 female and 11 male UoB alumni have given presentations since 2015, attended by 143 female and 68 male students.

**Networking between UGs and PGs** (**BA3.1**) is encouraged through shared social events. These were requested by UG feedback to the EDIC to “demystify” postgraduate study and provide advice on applying for PhDs.

**Summer internships** in SBS research groups provide research experience and extended contact with UGs, PGs and academic staff. PIs typically pay living expenses. Of 29 such summer internships since 2015, 18 students (9 male, 9 female) went on to PhD study. Feedback from second-year fieldcourses also reveal their importance in promoting scientific careers.

The **2016-7 SSS, Student-staff Liaison Committee, additional EDIC focus groups, and APM feedback** requested:

- **AP5.1:** Improved PG teaching opportunities, feedback, and formal recognition of their role in mentoring undergraduates
- **AP5.2:** Improve supervision further through better and more informative feedback to supervisors
• APS.3: Improved mentoring and integration of MRes students, by introducing more frequent APMs and for international students

(v) Support offered to those applying for research grant applications

Comment and reflect on support given to staff who apply for funding and what support is offered to those who are unsuccessful.

UoB Research and Enterprise Development (RED) connects researchers working in complementary fields, supplies successful application examples, and runs mock RCUK panels. University Research Institutes provide pilot funding for key inter-disciplinary research themes e.g. the Global Challenges Research Fund.

Submission plans are discussed and coordinated during APRs, and ECRs advised about typical preparation times. PI are advised to name contributing ECRs on grant applications. Staff are encouraged to present proposals at Round Table Seminars, and to attend RED grant workshops.

The SBS internal peer review process formalises support to PIs on all RCUK grant proposals: two senior academics nominated by the Research Committee provide feedback on applications.

Following unsuccessful applications, the RC Chair meets applicants to offer support, remind applicants of realistic success rates, and that writing applications creates ideas and strengthens collaborations.

• Female success rate in grants has increased between 2013-18 and become more equitable across gender in the last two years, despite low numbers overall (Table 17). There are no gender differences in the amount of funding requested (Figure 24).

• Despite fluctuations seen within years due to low numbers of successful applications, grant success across all years by academic grades is consistent and equitable with respect to gender (c. 20%: Figure 23).

• There is an increase in the % female staff applying for grants in a given year between 2013 and 2017 (25% to 35%; the 2017-8 period is incomplete) (Table 17).
Table 17. Staff probability of applying for grants and probability of success (2013-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Staff Submitting Applications</th>
<th>Total Applications</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>% Staff Applying</th>
<th>% Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23. Staff probability of success for grant applications yearly since 2013, split by gender (F = Female, M = Male) and grade (F = Fellow, SL/R = Senior Lecturer/Reader, P = Professor). Undetermined = outcome not yet known.
Figure 24. Box plots (median, 25th to 75th quartile, and range) of funding requested in 2013-8 grant applications relative to Academic Staff grade.
5.4: Career development: professional and support staff

(i) Training

Describe the training available to staff at all levels in the department. Provide details of uptake by gender and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. How is its effectiveness monitored and developed in response to levels of uptake and evaluation?

Training needs are identified for PSS through APR, as well as at Faculty level if PS roles change. PSS are also asked about training requirements during fortnightly one-to-one meetings with their line manager.

Completion rates of online training are high for PS staff: 100% (17) of female and 67% (8) of male staff undertook ‘Equality and Diversity’ training, and 87% (15) of female and 67% (8) of male staff completed the module ‘Student Mental Health and Well-being’.

Recent Faculty-wide improvements in career support for technical staff (5.4.iii) provide additional training to improve networking and career progression opportunities for technical staff.

The SBS provides financial support, agile working and leave to encourage attendance at management courses, attended by 12 administrative staff (75% female); 26 technical staff (31% female).

Two PSS completed the PGCert in Higher Education Administration, Management and Leadership. The SEA was subsequently promoted to Deputy School Manager in another School (Case Study 1). Four PSS attended the UoB Manager Induction Programme for PS managers, and the Technical Leaders Programme in 2017.

More PS Staff now undergo training (380 courses taken during 2014–17), with appropriate gender ratios, given PSS composition (58% female in 2016-7).

In the 2017 SSS, 88% of PS Staff were in favour of personal development training; 70% felt supported by management with training and advancement opportunities.

(ii) Appraisal/development review

Describe current appraisal/development review schemes for professional and support staff at all levels and provide data on uptake by gender. Provide details of any appraisal/review training offered and the uptake of this, as well as staff feedback about the process.

The APR process for PS staff is the same as for academic staff (5.3.ii). However, it is supplemented by informal fortnightly one-to-one meetings with senior line managers, to discuss performance and career aspirations.

Training in giving effective APRs is mandatory for all new line managers and uptake of APR is high, with 100% completion in the administrative team (9 female, 1 male), 90% in the technical team (12/13 female, 8/9 males) in 2016–17.
“[The APR has] been good for my personal and professional development. It makes me feel comfortable discussing my role and my future with my line manager. It’s also a great tool to get feedback on where I can improve (and where I’m already doing well)” (PS staff, SSS, 2017).

(iii) Support given to professional and support staff for career progression

Comment and reflect on support given to professional and support staff to assist in their career progression.

Progression of PS staff is often possible by moving between Schools or Faculties within UoB (Case Study 1), given the transferable nature of their skills.

However, progression for technical staff is challenging given opportunities may exist only at other Universities. A lack of opportunities for career advancement was a key concern of PS staff in the 2016 SSSS (the first for which they canvassed).

Procedures put in place to address this are:

- The SEA, SAM and Technical Manager encourage staff to build networks across UoB, and develop transferrable skills, by assigning a cross-School mentor. The executive team (3 females) have all been assigned such mentors.

- Line managers alert PS staff to job vacancies and secondment opportunities in UoB. This will be developed further (AP6.1).

- Shadowing schemes are provided for PSS, and strategic retraining for redeployment of technical staff throughout the UK.

- Professional Services Awards are included within the Life Sciences Awards for formal CV recognition of PSS contributions.

- Introduction of Technical Career Framework at Faculty Level (Figure 25) to enhance progression strategy for technicians. Includes networking meetings at other institutions, support for flexible working and technical seminars.

- The apprentice scheme in the greenhouse and for admin staff (supported by SBS) has led to 4/6 apprentices obtaining a permanent PSS position or going on to postgraduate study.

- Grant-funded research technician roles provides a route to PG study. Since 2014, 6 out of 20 such technicians have proceeded to a PhD (4/13 females). They are supported by their PIs through the APR, and by the Technical Manager.

In 2015-8, out of 29 PSS leaving SBS, 6 moved to a higher grade within UoB (e.g. Case Study 1); 5 to one outside UoB; and 2 proceeded to postgraduate study (comparison not by gender because only 5 leavers were male).

PS staff felt that networking opportunities have improved within SBS in 2017 compared to 2016 (64% in 2017 vs 58% in 2016; SSS).
“I feel that there is more support for technicians and the School and University are making an effort to improve the inclusion of technicians within the University and to address the problem of career progression for technicians” (Technical PSS, SSS, 2017).

- AP6.1: Increase and better advertise opportunities for PSS career progression and promotion by improved cross-Faculty mentoring and support
- AP6.2: Evaluate the impact of Faculty-wide improvements for PSS and Technical Staff

**Figure 25**: The Technical Career Framework, to facilitate planning of training and progression across the Faculty.
Figure 26: The 2016 Life Sciences Award winners (in the School Newsletter)
5.5. Flexible working and managing career breaks

(i) Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: before leave

Explain what support the department offers to staff before they go on maternity and adoption leave.

The UoB provides online advice on maternity and adoption leave. The SBS makes additional allowances for restrictions to professional duties due to pregnancy or antenatal visits (BA18.1; Case Study1).

At 2016 EDIC focus groups, staff requested additional support and a supportive contact when coordinating periods of parental leave. Some were also unaware that support at the SBS level is more flexible than is advised at Faculty level.

SBS support for maternity now includes:
(1) **Bespoke parental “to do” lists** for organising maternity leave, tailored for each SBS role (PG, PDRA, Academic Staff, PSS), are available online, along with case studies. These documents are updated regularly by staff returning from leave.

(2) **Mentoring support for maternity through ‘Leave buddy’ system**: Each person going on maternity leave chooses a trusted person from their role with experience of leave, who assists with the lists on (1), including liaising with HR, and extending maternity leave if necessary.

- **AP7.1a**: Evaluate the success of (1) and (2) for new carers, and quantify the workload increase for leave buddies, to be included in the WAM (and shared across all staff).

(ii) **Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: during leave**

Explain what support the department offers to staff during maternity and adoption leave.

**Support during leave**: Employees are entitled to 52 weeks of maternity leave and maternity pay. Staff are encouraged to come into work occasionally during leave, on ‘keeping in touch’ days, to make return from leave less daunting (Case Study 1) and are invited to social events (BA15.2).

A month before return, the carer meets their line manager to discuss preferred future working patterns (and timing of any transitions to full-time work).

For **fixed-term staff**, someone can take their place during leave (contract end date remains unchanged). Alternatively, their contract can be extended by the length of the leave, and the PDRA continues the research after leave.

For **open-contract staff**, 16 weeks’ salary is provided for cover. For a key SBS activity, this can be increased (e.g., for the SEA in 2016-7).

**SBS has also additionally funded** one-month overlaps before and after maternity to ensure cover is effective and return is buffered. However, the statutory 16-week maternity cover only funds teaching associates, meaning that other PI duties must be deputised during maternity leave.

**Parents have the freedom to choose their availability for PI duties** during leave with a new “traffic light scheme”: Red (default level) is completely unavailable; Amber is available for urgent cases; and Green is available for enquiries. During any Red period, emails are diverted to the ‘leave buddy’; during Amber periods they are copied to the parent and ‘leave buddy’.

- **AP7.1b** will evaluate the success of this newly-introduced (2017) scheme for the mother and her research group, relative to the size of the burden it places on leave buddies. Additional workload for the buddy will be offset and shared across SBS by the WAM.

(iii) **Cover and support for maternity and adoption leave: returning to work**

Explain what support the department offers to staff on return from maternity or adoption leave. Comment on any funding provided to support returning staff.
Pathway 1 and 2 staff are encouraged to apply for the UoB **Returning Carers’ Scheme** when returning from more than four months leave to help PIs re-establish their research careers (2 females and 1 male have used this scheme since 2015).

“Funding from the Returners’ fund was used to employ the PDRA who covered my maternity leave. This has this given my students much appreciated continuity, and also meant I had a ‘softer landing’ on my return to work” (Academic returner from maternity leave, 2015).

**Carer social networks** are promoted on the EDIC website (BA11.4); a private family room in LSB is provided with facilities for expressing milk, breast-feeding and baby changing (Fig 28).

**External seminars are recorded** and made available for remote viewing (BA15.1).

**Returning parents are given a reduced administrative workload** for the first six months and supported in returning to duties (Case Study 1), and research (BA19.5).

![Family room with facilities for baby change, nursing and expressing.](image)

**Figure 28.** Family room with facilities for baby change, nursing and expressing.

(iv) **Maternity return rate**

Provide data and comment on the maternity return rate in the department. Data of staff whose contracts are not renewed while on maternity leave should be included in the section along with commentary.

Since 2015, 9 female staff have taken maternity leave in 11 instances (6 academic, 5 PS staff). Of these, 100% returned to work, and all but one remained in post for at least six, 12 or 18 months after returning. The person who left after six months did so because she applied for (and was offered) a promotion at another UoB School (Case Study 1).

(v) **Paternity, shared parental, adoption, and parental leave uptake**

Provide data and comment on the uptake of these types of leave by gender and grade. Comment on what the department does to promote and encourage take-up of paternity leave and shared parental leave.
**BA18.1** recorded all staff who became fathers. Since 2015, five staff members (all academic, 4 PIs; 1 STA) have become fathers, with six instances of leave: at least 2-week paternity leave (4), parental leave (1), or both paternity and parental leave (1). Two male PIs took the full six months available for shared parental leave. In 2015-8 no staff took adoption leave.

The procedures described for maternity leave also apply to paternity and shared parental leave. The EDIC website has links to fathers’ blogs and government schemes to promote shared parental leave. All events and social media groups are emphasised as for all parents, not just mothers.

“My partner is also a UoB employee, and we were encouraged to take shared parental leave, with me taking six months maternity leave, then us jointly taking a month of shared parental leave to facilitate a baby ‘hand-over’ period. My partner then took six months parental leave” (Academic staff, SSS 2017).

**(vi) Flexible working**

Provide information on the flexible working arrangements available.

UoB flexible working policy includes job share, flexible working hours, part-time working, term time or seasonal working, annual hours working, compressed hours, working from home, parental leave and career breaks.

The EDIC webpages and *EDI Bulletin* include a flexible working section along with the formal request form, as well as personal case studies (BA19.2, 19.3). Information on UoB flexible working policy is provided during APR as mandatory training.

89% of staff felt they could discuss changing their working hours with their line manager; 5% felt they could not do this. 78% felt they could discuss their work/life balance with their manager; 7% felt they could not this (SSS, 2017).

89% of staff work flexibly in some way, however only 10% do so by formal arrangement (SSS 2017). All staff who have applied for flexible working since 2014 have been successful (3 females, 1 male).

**Increased awareness of flexible working:** In 2014, 62% of male and 64% of female academic staff felt able to work flexibly; in 2017 this had risen to 91% of men and 97% of women (SSS).

All Committee chairs and senior roles (including the HoS) have at least one deputy (BA19.2). This SBS policy was driven personally by the HoS, to allow sharing of the administrative load, provide greater committee connectivity, and to allow staff needing to work flexibly to take on senior roles.

This policy convinced our incoming HoS that this was a role she could take on, given her caring responsibilities (Case study2). It also allowed our current HoS to successfully apply for an Advanced ERC grant in 2017, and for our former HoS to work agilely to deal with caring responsibilities.
Increased Faculty-wide support, mentoring and progression planning for specialist technicians also increases their facility to work flexibly (5.4.iii).

“Many more male colleagues are taking time off for paternity leave and working flexibly to accommodate childcare. There are also many more female colleagues and it is becoming rarer to be the only woman in a meeting. This is all very welcome indeed!” (Academic Staff SSS, 2017).

(vii) Transition from part-time back to full-time work after career breaks

Outline what policy and practice exists to support and enable staff who work part-time after a career break to transition back to full-time roles.

Knowing that returning to full-time work after a break is supported can encourage men to temporarily go part-time share more caring responsibilities with their partners. SBS policy (and UK government guidance) on this is promoted on the EDIC website.

As well as formal policy, SBS supports staff in “phased returns” to full-time work. Issues are discussed with their line manager before returning, and (as when returning from parental leave) adjustments are made to reduce teaching and administrative workload, accommodate health issues (Case Study 1) or to prioritise research.

The process can also be reversed if the change is not what they want. Agile working is promoted on the EDIC website and the Athena SWAN blogs (BA19.3).
Athena SWAN in action

Hear firsthand from current staff members about their experiences integrating their personal and caring responsibilities with their careers.

“The flexibility of managing my own time as a student was invaluable for maintaining an effective work life balance.”
— Dr. Andy Wearfield, Senior Teaching Associate, School of Biological Sciences

“I work from home most of the time and the time I save not having to commute to work makes a big difference.”
— Dr. Karen Yarnham, PhD Alumni, School of Biological Sciences

“Although teaching in many ways demands extensive challenges for any trainee and student, it is a rewarding and enjoyable experience.”
— Dr. Patricia Sanchez-Barcelo, Royal Society University Research Fellow, School of Geographical Sciences

“My two years spent at Plymouth Polytechnic studying for an MSc in Applied Biology were the turning point when I realised that I loved the practical side of science.”
— Ms Sue Holdwell, Science Technician, School of Biological Sciences

“I had not realised that there were opportunities for women who had taken time off from science to look after their young families.”
— Dr. Patricia Sanchez-Barcelo, Royal Society University Research Fellow, School of Geographical Sciences

Figure 29. Athena SWAN blogs from EDIC website provide case studies of flexible working, and integrating personal and caring responsibilities
5.6. Organisation and culture

(i) Culture

Demonstrate how the department actively considers gender equality and inclusivity. Provide details of how the Athena SWAN Charter principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and workings of the department.

The SBS champions diversity, equality, transparency, and celebrates intellectual curiosity. Appropriate behaviour policy is available online, and is provided on induction. Staff are advised how to report concerns about the behaviour of others (BA16.1).

“I’ve worked elsewhere in UoB and SBS has the best culture I’ve yet experienced. There is a collegiate atmosphere and I’m treated with great respect and courtesy by all my colleagues. I really enjoy working here” (2016 SSS)

Athena SWAN principles are promoted through the EDIC website, and via UG lectures and tutorials. The EDI Bulletin details AS-relevant opportunities and events (BA16.4).

Awareness of gender issues: In 2014, 3% of male and 44% of female academic staff felt that “gender affects the way I am treated at work”; in 2017 this had risen to 9% of men but fallen to 29% of women, reflecting a more gender-aware culture in the School.

New papers, grants, and technical achievements are celebrated in the SBS Newsletter, in emails from the HoS, and at monthly coffee-and-cake celebrations. Annual ‘Life Sciences Awards’ celebrate individuals and teams, especially PSS and PGs (Fig 26).

In 2014, 76% of male and 67% of female PGs felt that successes are adequately celebrated. In 2017 this was 97% of male PGs and 96% of female PGs (SSS).

Promoting health and well-being: ‘Well-being and Mindfulness’ courses are organised for SBS staff and students, as well as regular yoga and tai chi classes. Mandatory training includes recognising signs of stress and mental ill-health, especially in students.

In 2014, 31% of male and 22% of female PGs felt that SBS supported them in striking a positive work/life balance; In 2017 this rose to 57% of male and 57% of female PGs (SSS).

Increased and more equitable networking support: In 2014, 55% of male and 33% of female academic staff felt the SBS provided adequate opportunities for networking. In 2017 this had risen to 73% of male and 63% of female academic staff (SSS).
(ii) HR policies

Describe how the department monitors the consistency in application of HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Describe actions taken to address any identified differences between policy and practice. Comment on how the department ensures staff with management responsibilities are kept informed and updated on HR policies.

The SBS have dedicated Faculty HR contacts, and host fortnightly HR clinics. Changes to HR policies are communicated in the SBS bulletin and on the intranet. We also invite the HR manager to update the School in our termly School Assemblies (BA16.2).

We promote awareness of UoB policy on inappropriate behaviour through:
- The EDI website and mandatory training sessions at APR (BA16.4)
- In-house mandatory training in recognising and dealing with inappropriate behaviour (BA16.1)
• Written policy on behaviour provided during induction and online (BA16.1)
• Promoting Faculty-wide reporting schemes
• Displaying posters about challenging inappropriate behaviour

Despite actions above to increase awareness of HR policy, there are occasions when inappropriate behaviour occurs and is reported. In 2015-8, there were 1-2 cases under formal investigation at a given time in SBS.

**Inappropriate behaviour is reported** via three mechanisms (Fig 31):

- External mentors and Acceptable Workplace Advisors to whom behaviour issues can be raised informally (BA16.2). This is important given all parties may be unaware inappropriate behaviour has occurred.
- Anonymously via the EDIC website or through the UoB “Report and Support” scheme.
- Formally through HR procedures and staff tribunals.

We are confident that a culture in SBS now exists where inappropriate behaviour is far more promptly and properly reported, and is dealt with swiftly and fairly.

“The workshop on behaviour led to a big improvement in the atmosphere in the School. This brought a step change towards the School feeling like one team.” (SSS, 2017).

81% agreed that there was a culture of respect and support within the School. However, 10% thought inappropriate behaviour was not dealt with sufficiently swiftly (SSS, 2017).

**Feedback from** Acceptable Workplace Advisors suggests that cases may become formalised where informal approaches would be faster and more effective (AP8.1). Similarly, often bystanders could have intervened to limit such behaviour, preventing it requiring formal reporting (AP8.2).

- **AP8.1(a):** Introduce “Active Bystander training” to clarify what should happen if others witness unacceptable behaviour; and to encourage informal resolution of issues.
- **AP8.1(b):** Resolve behaviour complaints through active informal resolution where possible, while ensuring escalation to more extended formal resolution occurs if appropriate.

**HR policy means we cannot summarise** the number of reports of unacceptable behaviour to the School, or the proportion successfully resolved. Without such a mechanism, second-hand knowledge and hearsay may amplify their impact. This may explain why 10% of SSS respondents feel that reporting does not lead to swift resolution.
• **AP8.2: Improving processes for reporting summary progress with cases.** We will work with HR, the unions and Faculty to develop an approved process for informing staff and students of the outcomes of behaviour reporting, and to provide numbers of cases under scrutiny.

![Process for dealing with inappropriate behaviour](image)

**Figure 31.** Reporting flowchart for staff and poster of Acceptable Workplace Advisors

(iii) **Representation of men and women on committees**

Provide data for all committees broken down by gender and staff types. Identify the most influential committee. Explain how potential committee members are identified and comment on any consideration given to gender equality in the selection of representatives, and on what the department is doing to address any imbalances. Comment on how the issue of committee overload is addressed where there are small numbers of men or women.

The EDIC monitors gender representation on committees, and APRs assess staff committee membership and workload. The SPARC is the most influential committee and is only open to committee chairs.

The HoS emails staff annually to ask which committees they would like to join (or leave) and why. **BA12.2 and BA14.2** ensured that administrative jobs are for a maximum of four years, allowing rotation to support progression and promotion, appropriate gender representation, and to minimise female overburdening.

Committee members are selected to ensure staff roles, experience and gender are appropriately represented, and in consultation during APR on how a role would aid career progression.
Over 2014-8 most committees have a gender balance that is representative for the role profiles of the SBS, including for the most influential committee (SPARC). All but one committee currently has female representation (Table 19).

However, there are large fluctuations between years on key committees (e.g. the Staff/Student Liaison Committee), and overrepresentation of female academic staff on the EDIC and underrepresentation on the Research Committee.

- AP8.3: Balance the gender and variety of career stages on all committees by recruiting ECRs and reviewing annually. Include ensuring appropriate gender representation on the Terms of Reference for each committee.

Table 19: Female representation on committees. BCAI and TPARC did not exist until 2016 and 2017 respectively. AS = Academic Staff; PS = Professional Services Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Mean % F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Resources (SPARC)*</td>
<td>AS 25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Committee*</td>
<td>AS 16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Committee</td>
<td>AS 50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Committee*</td>
<td>AS 20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Student Liaison Committee</td>
<td>AS 100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Planning (TPARC)</td>
<td>AS 33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAI Committee (Agricultural Grants)</td>
<td>- 33%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS - 50%</td>
<td>- 50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Diversity Inclusivity (EDIC)</td>
<td>AS 50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS 0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG/PG</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Promotions Committee</td>
<td>AS 40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iv) Participation on influential external committees

How are staff encouraged to participate in other influential external committees and what procedures are in place to encourage women (or men if they are underrepresented) to participate in these committees?

Given their importance in SBS representation and promotion, external panels are considered in the Workload Allocation Model, and encouraged at APRs.

Faculty vacancies are circulated by email and at Staff Assemblies; suitable SBS candidates are also approached by the HoS.

Membership of grant panels (via application to peer review colleges) is encouraged for ECRs. Currently 6/10 female and 9/25 male open-contract academic staff are on
influential external committees (e.g. BBSRC Committee B, Royal Society Research Grants panel, NERC Panels).

(v) Workload model

Describe any workload allocation model in place and what it includes. Comment on ways in which the model is monitored for gender bias and whether it is taken into account at appraisal/development review and in promotion criteria. Comment on the rotation of responsibilities and if staff consider the model to be transparent and fair.

A Workload Allocation Model (WAM) was introduced in 2014 (BA14.1), to ensure that workload is fairly distributed across roles, grades, and genders. The SPARC consulted the EDIC in its generation, to support staff conducting activities associated with EDI, such as outreach (BA17.1).

HR and Finance provide data on staff commitments, while staff specify at APR which of their external tasks have a key role in their career progression.

Any inequalities relative to gender and role are presented to the SMT and addressed through reallocation of tasks in the light of APR discussions. Each term’s WAM, and administrative and committee task lists are published on the intranet (BA14.1).

Latest 2017 data (Table 20) shows that female and male Professors spend similar time on research, and workload is approximately equal.

However, at Reader and Senior Lecturer level, gender differences emerge, possibly because, until the WAM is standardised across the LSF (AP8.4), SBS administrative support only assess large tasks (external tasks considered at APR only supplement data supplied to the WAM).

Also, 1/6 (17%) of the male and 2/2 (100%) of the female Senior Lecturers are new members of staff who have also not yet taken on full teaching, administrative or research duties. This is contributing to the gender variance observed at these grades.

Table 20: Average annual hourly workload split by gender and role (2017-8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>Senior Lecturer*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female (4)</td>
<td>Male (13)</td>
<td>Female (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgrad students</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes recent arrivals so figures do not represent full annual cycle

Feedback related to the WAM (from focus groups, and SSS) suggests that happiness in workload and work/life balance increased from 31% in 2014 to 54% in 2017 in females and is more equitable across genders in 2017 (6% higher in females) compared to 2014.
(19% higher in males). However, the absolute values remain low, indicating a need for improvements to the WAM.

In 2014, 37% of male and 14% of female academic staff felt that SBS supported them in striking a positive work/life balance; in 2017 this was 48% of male and 39% of female staff (SSS).

- **AP8.4: Introduction of Faculty-wide Workload Allocation Model founded on the SBS model**, including a computational tool to assess workloads with some tasks weighted positively to encourage involvement (e.g. in outreach), or external responsibilities that improve promotional prospects.

(vi) **Timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings**

Describe the consideration given to those with caring responsibilities and part-time staff around the timing of departmental meetings and social gatherings.

SBS policy is that all meetings and social events are held during hours conducive for carers (10am–4pm) (BA15.2). However, some social events do occur outside working hours, to cater for people with different preferences for socialising with colleagues (BA15.3).

- External speakers are available during the afternoon and the evening. Round Table Round Table Seminars alternate annually between 1-2pm and 4-5pm (to allow evening discussions, at the request of PG students); seminars are recorded by lecture capture (BA15.1)
- SBS members can invite family members to the summer BBQ and External Examiners’ party (afternoon and evening events)
- Most evening social events begin at 4pm to allow young children to join at least for the first hour.

In 2014, 53% of male and 13% of female academic staff felt meetings were timed to account for those with caring responsibilities; in 2017 this had risen to 70% of men and 65% of women (SSS).

- **AP8.6: Reinforce policy that timing of School meetings and seminars should accommodate carers** by introducing timings of meetings on terms of reference of committees; some seminars and events may still begin at 4 pm, but they will be recorded, and speakers made available before the talk for research discussion.
(vii) Visibility of role models

Describe how the institution builds gender equality into organisation of events. Comment on the gender balance of speakers and chairpersons in seminars, workshops and other relevant activities. Comment on publicity materials, including the department’s website and images used.

**SBS event organisation** aims to present diverse scientific and professional role models as role models, including those with caring responsibilities. The EDIC chair gives an annual PG seminar to highlight how role models can promote (and prevent) scientific careers.

“I went to your lecture on science and gender. I found it really motivating and inspiring. I'm interested in helping out with volunteering opportunities promoting awareness for the problems that women in science face” (Email from first-year student, 2016).

**The UoB EDI unit organises the “HerStories” talks**, highlighting career paths of senior professional and academic women (the incoming HoS will give a talk in 2018).
The SBS organises four main seminar series: (1) **Monday Research Seminars**; (2) **Workshops in Ecology and Behaviour**; (3) **Round Table Seminars** and (4) **Plant Sciences talks**. Each of those is run by two ECRs, who solicit suggestions from academic staff, and select speakers to reflect appropriate gender balance and seniority.

Seminars involving more ECRs (e.g. 2. 3 above) are better gender balanced than the Monday seminar series (19% female speakers, 2016/7, Figure 34). Across seminar series, 42% of chairs are female (from 64 talks in 2016-17 where chair gender was recorded).

- **AP8.6**: Encourage a more diverse range of speakers for Monday seminar series; ensure that provision for speakers with caring responsibilities is promoted at invitation.
Figure 34. Speakers by gender at the SBS seminar series in 2016 and 2017

The SBS Newsletter highlights the career paths of School members via AS blogs (BA19.3) and “Day in the Life” interviews. Since 2015, 9/12 of the AS bloggers have been female. For “Day in the Life” interviews, 8 have been by academic staff (63% female), and 10 PS staff (40% female).

Online material:
- Any SBS member can submit successes (grants, prizes, papers) to the Newsletter, Twitter feed and EDI Bulletin.
- PIs are asked to nominate group members’ news for the Newsletter
- Congratulations emails from the HoS are collated by admin staff and recipients pro-actively approached to contribute a press release.
- Images on the website and publicity materials are monitored by the admin staff and aim for 50: 50 gender representation.

(viii) Outreach activities

Provide data on the staff and students from the department involved in outreach then engagement activities by gender and grade. How is staff and student contribution to outreach and engagement activities formally recognised? Comment on the participant uptake of these activities by gender.

Academic Staff and PG outreach activities are recorded (BA2.4) and discussed during the APR and APM and assessed alongside each staff member’s WAM. They are celebrated on social media and on the website (BA17.1) (Fig 35; Fig 36).

SBS staff (especially technical staff) host part of the UoB’s Widening Participation programme at LSB, through “Access to Bristol” events (86 16+ children since 2015), and visits to experience laboratory science (~5 primary and secondary schools annually, 45 children each).
The SBS identifies State Schools sending low numbers to Higher Education, and funds coach transport to LSB where necessary. Since October 2018, SBS staff have also visited seven schools, two of which are eligible for contextual offers at UoB.

Feedback from these events is passionate and inspiring. However, its effectiveness in improving access to HE for economically-deprived children is often long-term and difficult to evaluate. Females tend to participate more in outreach activities across roles, apart from postgraduates (Table 21).

However, these data remain hard to interpret in terms of the time spent per activity, also given changes in % female in these roles during these years. Also, we do not collect data from technical staff for Widening Participation activities, although they play a critical role in their delivery.

- AP1.2(b): Improve recording of outreach and widening participation activities for all staff, postgraduates, including preparation time and activity duration.

Table 21. Percentage of males and female engaging in outreach activities in 2015-8 by role. Numbers in each role are estimated as the mean during this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number (%) of Males involved</th>
<th>Number of activities by males</th>
<th>Number (%) of females involved</th>
<th>Number of activities by females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduates</td>
<td>6/43 (13%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/54 (9%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDRAs /Teaching Associates</td>
<td>4/5 (75%)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7/8 (87%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow/SL/Reader</td>
<td>11/17 (65%)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5/6 (83%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7/14 (50%)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35. Bristol Soapbox Science event (BA2.4; BA5.1), July 2016
Figure 36: Outreach activities by SBS members: (Top) 2015 Bristol Festival of Nature; (BR) 2015 Seeds of Change Art/Science event; (BR) Science week at Cabot Circus Shopping Centre (2015).
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Case study 1: Ms Charlie Cowley (female)

Professional Services, Former Senior Executive Assistant, SBS.

From October 2017, Deputy School Manager, School of Economics, Finance & Management.

I joined the SBS in October 2013 as a Senior Executive Assistant. What quickly became apparent to me within the first 12 months in post, was that I was respected as a valued member of the School, who was actively encouraged by senior staff to contribute to School strategy. Whilst this could have been down to my enthusiasm to get fully involved in School business, I actually feel it had a lot to do with the fact that the SMT actively encouraged the inclusion of PS staff in School decision-making and promoted University staff development opportunities to both its academic and PS staff.

I was not only supported but also encouraged to attend various training courses to maintain my professional development. A particular example of this is the School’s agreement to invest in my further education by supporting my application to enrol in a
Post-Graduate Certificate programme in Administration, Management and Leadership in Higher Education, run by the AUA. This programme has not only given me a broader understanding of what is happening at Government level within the Higher Education sector, but I do believe it has helped me progress my career to date. This includes my recent promotion to another School at UoB so soon after my return from maternity leave.

In April 2016, I informed the SMT that I was expecting my first baby, due November of the same year. Throughout the pregnancy I felt the impact of fatigue, discomfort and all manner of other pregnancy-related issues, and the support I received from the School during this time was nothing short of outstanding. Not only was I provided with the usual formalities including a Workstation Assessment, alternative furniture and equipment to help me work comfortably, meetings to discuss options for maternity leave etc., but I was also allowed to work more flexibly to be able to attend antenatal appointments, was provided taxis home when I was feeling unwell, and was given more administrative support for various projects I was involved with to help alleviate fatigue.

The School were happy to accommodate my request for “Keeping In Touch” days and ensured I had work to do when I returned. I was given updates about School business and met with work colleagues socially at lunchtimes to rekindle working relationships. All of this made the transition back to work a smooth one.

This level of support continued when I returned to work after seven months of maternity leave. The School not only allowed me to adjust my working hours to accommodate childcare requirements, but also agreed to provide me with a new laptop to support my role when needing to work from home due to childcare issues.

Overall, the support I've received from the School over the last four years has been exceptional. I have never felt so valued and supported in a workplace and a lot of that is down to the School’s commitment to ensuring equality, diversity and professional development lie at the heart of its responsibilities. I feel very proud and lucky to have worked for such an establishment.
I joined the School as a lecturer in September 2000, and have been regularly promoted: to Reader 2004, Professor 2009, senior Professor 2014 and Head of School 2018. I have significant caring responsibilities.

The flexibility of academic work and the support of an increasingly understanding work place has made a successful career possible. I have been able to take time out for hospital visits and work wherever I am, whenever I can. For example, after the birth of my second child, I was awarded a six-month returners fellowship, which allowed me to prioritise my research. Changes to our teaching also helped. It has long been possible to reschedule teaching in an emergency and for the last decade each unit has usually been taught by multiple academic staff. This has made it possible to accommodate sudden caring responsibilities without letting students down. All this has allowed me to succeed in research, teaching, and a variety of administrative roles, most notably establishing and running Research Council funded PhD training programmes for a decade.

I am also indebted to some very supportive managers. In 2014 I decided I could not finish my promotion paperwork after my husband had a cardiac arrest three days before the deadline. I decided to skip that year’s promotions round and apply the following year. On hearing this Jane Memmott, the Head of School (and Biological Sciences’ first female Head) found out from HR that she could help me, and prepared and submitted an outline case so beginning the application process on my behalf. This allowed me some weeks to flesh out my full case, leading directly to my promotion to senior Professor.

In another important example of support in 2017, my School Manager proposed to our senior management team that I be considered for Head of School even though I hadn’t put myself forward. I was approached and asked to consider applying, first by a female member of our senior management team, and then by a female academic from another Faculty who had previously been an outstanding Head of School. Talking to her really helped me to consider what the job would entail and whether I might be able to do it.

I still wouldn’t have applied, though, if we hadn’t made one other important change to the way the school runs. In implementing our Athena SWAN Bronze actions we introduced deputies for key roles, including two Deputy Heads of School. This has made the Head of School job possible for someone like me who can’t always guarantee to be available. I couldn’t have contemplated applying for Head of School if we hadn’t made
this crucial structural change along with many other cultural and structural changes that accommodate increasingly diverse staff and much more flexible and agile working.
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6 FURTHER INFORMATION
Recommended word count: Bronze: 500 words | Silver: 500 words

Please comment here on any other elements that are relevant to the application.

7 ACTION PLAN
The action plan should present prioritised actions to address the issues identified in this application.

Please present the action plan in the form of a table. For each action define an appropriate success/outcome measure, identify the person/position(s) responsible for the action, and timescales for completion.

The plan should cover current initiatives and your aspirations for the next four years. Actions, and their measures of success, should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART).

See the awards handbook for an example template for an action plan.